

School Building Authority of West Virginia
NEEDS PROJECT EVALUATION ANALYSIS
November 4, 2019

The following analysis provides information on the School Building Authority staff's project evaluation process. The staff believes the duty of providing to the Authority fair, comprehensive, and thorough reviews of each project is one of the most important and vital tasks with which we are charged. As the staff is looked upon to provide comprehensive details of each project, we are always seeking ways to improve this process. Since it is our principal duty to ensure that tasks are executed judiciously and funds are expended wisely, we are acutely aware of the magnitude of responsibility we have to the Authority, and ultimately, the taxpayers of the state.

[Section 200](#) of the SBA's Policy & Procedures Handbook describes the evaluation process by stating, "The SBA staff is charged with using all available resources to objectively evaluate each project proposal in order to make funding recommendations to the Authority that exhibit a prudent, resourceful, economic, and efficient expenditure of state funds... The Authority will receive the recommendations of the SBA staff and take all disclosed information into consideration when making funding decisions."

In order to effectively understand the process of the staff's evaluation, the grant application process, as a whole, must first be considered. [Section 201](#) of the SBA's policy handbook describes the steps for counties submitting Needs Grant proposals, which can be summarized as follows:

- The Project must be listed in the county's current Comprehensive Educational Facilities Plan (CEFP). If it is not, the CEFP must be amended and approved by the WVBE and SBA to include the project.
- The county is responsible for selecting from the prioritized list in the CEFP which project will be submitted to the SBA for funding consideration.
- By the established annual deadline, the county submits a Needs Grant Application (Form 201, **Exhibit A**) which has been revised to include specific questions related to the points in W.Va. Code regarding how projects are to be evaluated ([§18-9D-16](#)). This application requires a budgetary estimate of probable cost from a registered Architect and/or Engineer (A/E), which is one of the most critical elements of the submission. The County's A/E and the SBA must be certain that the county can realistically complete the entire scope of the project within the funding amounts proposed, while not asking for too large of a grant request. For new schools, a site feasibility study, with geotechnical reports and subsurface information, is required.
- The SBA staff performs an on-site evaluation of the existing facility(s) affected. Their report will verify the scope of the project, assess cost estimates, evaluate the feasibility of the proposals, consider alternative options, and discuss program requirements, building utilization, transportation, demographic, and other related issues.
- The Superintendent and Board President of each submitting county will present the need for their particular project in a public interview with the Authority. The interview provides the opportunity for local officials to express the importance of the project, clarify issues or questions regarding the project, and familiarize Authority members with the projects in a question and answer session. The SBA staff's on-site evaluation report will be provided to the Authority as a supplement to the county's information.
- At the conclusion of the interviews, the SBA staff will gather and compile all data to create a prioritized list of rankings and recommendations in accordance with the provisions outlined in W.Va. Code [§18-9D-16](#), as well as the mission and goals of the Authority as listed in [§18-9D-15](#).

- Using all data, information, and recommendations made available by the staff, the Authority will deliberate and select meritorious projects. Grants are awarded to the extent funds are available.

The counties that are successful in receiving grant funding will then move on to the next phases of project development. Generally, these steps are completed *after* a grant is awarded and the agreement is signed with the SBA.

- An Architect / Engineer is formally hired using the qualifications-based selection (QBS) process per [W.Va. Code §5-G](#), and with the SBA's new A/E Supplemental Requirements of the Contract.
- An Educational Specification (Ed. Spec.), including a Program of Spaces, is completed by a county's planning committee, the Architect, and the SBA staff (when desired). In general, the Ed. Spec. tells the Architect specifically what to design in the new or renovated facility. This includes space requirements, spatial arrangements, room counts, technology inclusions, utility needs, environmental considerations, among many things. Requirements for the Ed. Spec. are described in [Section 301](#) of the SBA policy handbook. Requirements for school design are described in [WVBE Policy 6200 – Handbook on Planning School Facilities](#).
- The Architect uses the Ed. Spec., WVBE Policy 6200, the SBA Quality & Performance Standards handbook, and all other applicable building codes and policies to design the school. Plans for site development and the specific arrangement of spaces are developed at increasing levels of detail throughout the design. The SBA requires review and approval of the design and budget at specific phases of development.
- The SBA approves the final design and final estimate of probable cost. If at any time a budget deficit is projected, the SBA requires the County to either reduce the scope of the work or provide additional local funding. Upon the completion of the design and the estimate, the project is released to bid.
- A mandatory pre-bid conference is held for prospective bidders.
- Bids are received and opened at the county board office according to the bid requirements.
- Contractors are selected and contracts are signed. The project proceeds to the construction phase.

Some counties may elect to complete a few of the “post-funding” steps prior to the Authority's selection in order to show momentum for the project during the public interview; however, this is done at the risk of the County or their Architect pending the SBA's funding decision. Costs associated with the “post-funding” steps are not eligible for reimbursement from the SBA until after a grant agreement is signed. These costs are typically much greater than the grant application process as they require significant work of Architects, Engineers, or Facilities Planners.

While the SBA staff works to provide specific information and details to the Authority as projects are up for funding consideration, there are many details and unknowns that will be worked out after grants are awarded. Given the information that is available prior to the grant award and understanding what is typically not available until further in the development process, the project evaluation can only include a certain amount of detailed facts. Much of the information the staff uses to evaluate projects is based on what is revealed by the counties and their design professionals, but also the knowledge gained in working from conception to completion of many other SBA-funded projects.

West Virginia Code [§18-9-D-16\(a\)\(3\)\(D\)](#) describes the steps for which projects shall be evaluated. They are based on two major factors; one of which has nine criteria:

“The objective criteria for the evaluation of projects which shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. “How the current facilities do not meet and how the plan and any project under the plan meets the following:
 - I. Student health and safety including, but not limited to, critical health and safety needs;
 - II. Economies of scale, including compatibility with similar schools that have achieved the most economical organization, facility use and pupil-teacher ratios;
 - III. Reasonable travel time and practical means of addressing other demographic considerations...
 - IV. Multicounty and regional planning to achieve the most effective and efficient instructional delivery system;
 - V. Curriculum improvement and diversification, including the use of instructional technology, distance learning and access to advanced courses in science, mathematics, language arts and social studies;
 - VI. Innovations in education;
 - VII. Adequate space for projected student enrollments;
 - VIII. The history of efforts taken by the county board to propose or adopt local school bond issues or special levies to the extent Constitutionally permissible; and
 - IX. Regularly scheduled preventive maintenance; and
2. How the project will assure the prudent and resourceful expenditure of state funds and achieve the purposes of this article for constructing, expanding, renovating or otherwise improving and maintaining school facilities for a thorough and efficient education.”

In the most simplistic terms, the Code describes the evaluation process by asking the following questions: *How bad is the current situation? How good is the proposed solution? And, is this a good investment for the State?*

Given these factors and criteria, the SBA staff has, over the years, developed a scoring system that assigns points to each category based on the project’s inherent characteristics and plan for improvement. Projects are scored individually, but also in comparison to each other for consistency, so there may be slight variance from year to year. In the form that was recently adopted (**Exhibit B**), categories were arranged according to how they are listed in Code, definitions of categories were given to represent varying levels of how points are earned, and, most notably, categories were assigned a weighted factor in order to further separate quality projects with a high level of impact from those that are less impactful.

In an effort to explain the importance of the new scoresheet relating to the clarity of the criteria’s interpretation, the need to highlight specific criteria through weighted scoring, and given the availability of only certain information at this particular phase, the staff presents the following exercise showing how four different typical projects earn a score in the scoring template. The goal is to assure that every project is afforded the best opportunity to be presented clearly and fully.

EXAMPLE PROJECTS:

The following projects presented to the SBA staff in a Grant Application (**Exhibit A**). Facts known at the time of submission are summarized:

County A – New PreK-8 School
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County A proposes a new 550 student PreK-8 facility. • Upon completion of the new school, an existing elementary school that has been in use since 1935 and an existing middle school that has been in use since 1970 will close.

- Each old school has numerous life, health, and safety issues. HVAC, electrical, and plumbing needs, along with roofing and building envelope issues create a high price tag for renovation at both existing facilities.
- The county has selected three potential sites but has yet to make a final decision.
- The county plans to greatly enhance curriculum offerings within new spaces. The school will be set up in an “Exploratorium” style layout with breakout spaces for individual studies of specific subjects. These spaces will support a Project-Based Learning teaching method in which specific teachers have been trained for this curriculum delivery model.
- Based on the desire for the Exploratorium design, the proposed square footage for the new school is 10% higher than the SBA’s Square Feet Per Student Allowance ([SBA Form 208](#)).
- The county has historically struggled financially but was able to come up with a 15% local match in funding toward the cost of this project.

County B – Infrastructure Upgrades at Area Middle School

- County B proposes HVAC, electrical, plumbing, lighting, and sprinkler system upgrades at the Middle School, which had served the community as a high school in the past. The proposed renovations bring all systems up to current building codes and standards.
- County B had proposed building an entirely new Area Middle School, but costs associated with site development and property acquisition, along with the cost of the new building, were excessive when compared to the renovation costs associated with this project. Given the declining enrollment in the area, the existing building is considerably much larger in square footage than what the county would be eligible for in a new middle school facility.
- The proposed improvements at this school will make operations and functionality of the systems and equipment similar to a new school. Only preventative maintenance will need to be completed in the foreseeable future (20+ years).
- The county has committed a 5% local match in funding toward the cost of this project. They are considered average in terms of wealth in comparison with other counties.

County C – Roof Replacement at County C High School

- County C High School was constructed in 1994 with the use of SBA funds. The school currently serves 650 students in grades 9-12.
- The county has performed a fair amount of maintenance on the roof over the years, but there are a large number of leaks after 25 years.
- When it rains, water drips down through the ceiling and into six different classrooms on the upper floor. The gym floor has also been damaged in the past because of water leaks.
- The HVAC system has also reached the end of its life expectancy, but due to the high cost, the county did not request a replacement of this system at this time.
- County C was unable to commit any local funds toward this project. County C has been labeled a “Financially Distressed County” by the WV Department of Education’s Office of School Finance.

County D – Eight Classroom Addition at Town Elementary School

- County D projects an enrollment growth over the next ten years and proposes to build eight (8) new classrooms at Town Elementary School.
- The eight-classroom addition will allow the county to remove four (4) portable buildings currently in use that have a moldy odor and show deterioration throughout. These portables were installed “temporarily” in 1985 but were never taken out of commission.

- The new classrooms the county proposes are slightly larger than what WVBE Policy 6200 describes (1,000 SF designed compared to 720 SF in policy). This represents approximately an extra 2,240 square feet and an extra \$700,000 cost to the total project.
- The county is considered wealthy given their financial condition and has committed a 50% local match toward the cost of this project. The county also mentions that even if this project is not awarded SBA funds, they plan to complete the entire scope on their own.

NOTE: These example projects are in no way meant to suggest to any county that projects like these should be prioritized and submitted in lieu of the projects recommended in the county's long-range comprehensive educational facilities plan (CEFP). They are simply case studies that include many details from previous project submissions to show how scoring interpretations can be applied.

After each project is received, the submitted information is thoroughly reviewed, and each is visited by one or more of the SBA staff members. Discussions are held with the superintendent and county staff to gain as many details of the project that are available. Annual savings, cost avoidance, and alternative projects are discussed. The staff works to gain not just an idea of what is happening with the specifics related to this project, but also how it fits within the county's operations as a whole. The SBA staff may offer assistance and suggestions to aid in the thoroughness of the Superintendent's interview with the Authority. After the interview is complete, the SBA staff members work with the county administrators to find answers to any questions that came as a result of the interview. The SBA staff then sits down and considers the merits of each project using the method described below with the Evaluation Form (**Exhibit B**).

EXAMPLE PROJECT SCORING:

The SBA staff uses the criteria described in code and applies the project facts to give categorical and overall scores. For the first nine criteria, the Code provides the following question: **"How the current facilities do not meet and how the plan and any project under the plan meets the following:**

I. Student health and safety, including, but not limited to, critical health and safety needs;

NOTES:

The interpretation of this particular category is thorough as the staff uses reports and citations from various agencies (Fire Marshal, BRIM, WVDE Office of School Facilities, etc.) to verify and support the need for improvement. Given the importance of health and safety (H&S) on the building's students, teachers, and administrators, the maximum value for this category is set at fifteen, which magnifies the positive effects of the proposed improvements in the projects that are recommended. The staff believes that improving situations relating to H&S deficiencies is one of the most impactful and beneficial effects of SBA projects. Therefore, the point values associated with this category correlate with the desire to prioritize projects that address these issues.

Scoring System Application (As shown in Exhibit B)

Points Possible: 15

County	Remarks	Points Awarded
A	Life, health, and safety issues prevalent in both old schools, only way to score higher would be if facility is closed because of these issues. This project proposes to correct critical needs with the new PreK-8 school.	13

B	Project addresses H&S issues, but other than HVAC renovations related to air exchange requirements and sprinkler system improvements, none are presently critical.	7
C	Water intrusion from leaky roof presents mildew (potentially mold) issues as well as slippery walking surfaces. The staff reviews WVDE Office of School Facilities reports to see if mold was detected.	9
D	Portables in disrepair, students must travel outside in open-weather conditions to get to these classrooms. Staff verifies that portables are to be removed from county operation and sold.	12

Guidance Provided for Score:

- Limited effect on H&S (1)
- Generally positive effect on H&S (5)
- Addresses critical H&S Needs (10)
- Addresses near-emergency H&S needs that cannot be funded locally (15)

II. Economies of scale, including compatibility with similar schools that have achieved the most economical organization, facility use and pupil-teacher ratios;

NOTES:

Achieving Economies of Scale (EOS) in construction has been traditionally positive, because building larger typically represents a savings on a per unit basis. However, the effect of scoring this category with a high total of points inherently discourages a county from operating community schools. While achieving some economies of scale is generally positive, the effects of assigning a high number of points may be detrimental to a county's overall plan. The maximum value for this category is set at five, which aligns with the desire of the administration and the WVBE to reduce the priority of EOS consideration in a project evaluation. In each instance, the staff works with counties to provide necessary information when an EOS waiver is necessary.

Scoring System (As shown in Exhibit B)

Points Possible: 5

County	Remarks	Points Awarded
A	Neither existing school meets EOS requirements, and the proposed school meets the EOS requirements (480 required, 550 designed)	4
B	Facility does not meet EOS requirements. Economies of Scale Waiver submitted by county after staff review	3
C	Meets EOS guidelines, no proposed changes	3
D	Meets EOS guidelines, but enrollment does not greatly exceed EOS guidelines presently	3

Guidance Provided for Score: (New items added shown in **bold**)

- Does Not meet EOS Guidelines (1)
- Exactly meets EOS Guidelines *or* requests an EOS waiver *or* renovation project (3)
- **Addresses EOS deficiencies by building / renovating to meet EOS reqs. (4)**
- Greatly exceeds EOS Guidelines *or* (5)

III. Reasonable travel time and practical means of addressing other demographic considerations...

NOTES:

In each instance where a change in travel time is proposed, either positive or negative, the result is significant to the overall score. Given the importance of travel time on a student's daily routine, a

maximum point value of ten aligns with the substantive impact of other categories. The SBA staff works closely with county transportation personnel to determine the effect of new schools and the bus rides for students; however, this is not a category that sees much variance, as the majority of the requests within the last 5-10 years have been renovations. Each funding cycle, the SBA only receives 3-4 grant requests for new schools.

Scoring System (As shown in Exhibit B)

Points Possible: 10

County	Remarks	Points Awarded
A	The SBA staff is consulted by County transportation personnel and find that even though the new school is further away from the existing schools, one particular site (that also seems most feasible based on other criteria) is closer to the center of the school's attendance zone. In addition, the middle school students riding the bus no longer have to stop and wait for unloading/loading at a separate elementary school each day. Therefore, travel time is decreased for most students.	7
B	Renovation project, no change in travel time	5
C	Renovation project, no change in travel time	5
D	Renovation project, no change in travel time	5

Guidance Provided for Score: (New items added shown in **bold**)

- Greatly increases student travel time at or near the established limits (1)
- **Lengthens travel time for a majority of students, shortens for a few (3)**
- No change on travel time (5)
- Shortens travel time for a majority of students, **lengthens for a few (7)**
- **Shortens travel time for every student (10)**

IV. Multicounty and regional planning to achieve the most effective and efficient instructional delivery system;

NOTES:

The scoring system gives incremental credit for making strides in achieving effective and economical changes in multi-county or regional instructional delivery. Where there is a plan for cooperative utilization of facilities between or among other counties, points are awarded. The staff works to confirm the project's goals and merits with all counties affected. This is not a category that has seen much variance in the past 5-10 years, therefore the maximum value of 5 points for this category aligns with the substantive impact of other categories.

Scoring System (As shown in Exhibit B)

Points Possible: 5

County	Remarks	Points Awarded
A	While this is not planned as a multi-county or regional project, it is close enough to the county border where the expanded curriculum offerings may attract students from the adjacent county. The SBA staff asks the county personnel to explore this possibility. Upon investigation, the county reports that there is a desire from the area where up to 50 additional students may now attend this school. The design enrollment and square footage is adjusted accordingly.	3
B	The SBA staff confirms with local administrators that this is a single-county project.	1

C	This is the only high school within County C. Some students travel to the regional technical center. However, this project does not affect the partnership positively or negatively.	1
D	Similar to County A, this elementary school sits close to the county border. The school's curriculum offerings have already attracted students from the adjacent county. While this project represents no real change to the existing multi-county relationship, an extra point is awarded because the partnership is in place.	2

Guidance Provided for Score:

- Single-County Project (1)
- Single-County Project that could accept students from other counties (3)
- Multi-County / Regional Project (5)

V. Curriculum improvement and diversification, including the use of instructional technology, distance learning and access to advanced courses in science, mathematics, language arts and social studies;

NOTES:

Similar to addressing health and safety needs, the SBA staff feels that providing spaces and improvements to aid in the effectiveness of curriculum delivery is of great importance to the mission of the agency. While nobody in the SBA staff proclaims to be an expert on curriculum, we are acutely aware of the positive impacts that new or renovated spaces provide to the students' ability to receive a quality education. The staff interprets and applies this criterion through the lens of building design, architecture, and engineering with the understanding of how each contributes, both directly and indirectly, to the effectiveness of educational delivery. Where counties propose spaces that shape the building design, classroom layout, or overall spatial relationships that greatly enhance curriculum improvement and/or diversification, a high number of points are awarded. In these instances, counties must cite specific curricular improvements that will occur, not just generalized statements. Where counties provide specific technological inclusions or spatial characteristics that directly contribute to advancing the way curriculum is delivered, average points are awarded. Where improvements are made that indirectly affect the ability for the curriculum to be delivered, such as thermal or audial environmental improvements, partial points are awarded. The maximum value of fifteen points inherently prioritizes projects that propose curricular improvement measures while limiting points available in projects that address issues related to deferred maintenance, which also aligns with the Authority's desire for counties to provide funded depreciation of their building component systems.

Scoring System (As shown in Exhibit B)

Points Possible: 15

County	Remarks	Points Awarded
A	The SBA staff works with the county personnel to gain an understanding of how the proposed curriculum delivery method brings a dynamic change for all grade levels. Citing reports from the WVDE that show the effectiveness of this method in other schools in the state, the county believes that by using all technologies available, improvement can be made in each subject area at each grade level. The design of the proposed building is based on the curriculum delivery method, and the SBA staff directs the county to seek approval from the WVBE for this curriculum delivery method, which will qualify the county for an increased square footage allowance to cover the cost of construction.	14

B	While there is no direct curriculum improvement proposed, the air exchange improvements and fresh air introduction as proposed in the HVAC improvements allow for a much better thermal environment in the entire facility. The SBA staff verifies the WVDE Office of School Facilities' report which mentions the ineffectiveness of the current HVAC system. The improvements will decrease CO ₂ levels in the classrooms and allow students the ability to pay better attention to curriculum delivery. This is an indirect but positive change to the effectiveness of curriculum delivery.	3
C	No direct changes to curriculum delivery, however, roof leaks from a rainstorm would no longer be a distraction to students in the 6 affected classrooms. This reflects a slight indirect improvement to the effectiveness of curriculum delivery.	2
D	No direct curriculum changes are proposed. However, new, state-of-the-art classrooms are proposed which include electrical upgrades, new fixed equipment, and technology improvements that aid in the curriculum delivery.	4

Guidance Provided for Score:

- No direct or indirect change to curriculum delivery (1)
- Limited or indirect changes / improvements to curriculum delivery (5)
- Project gives the ability to introduce a new courses or technology; direct curriculum improvement (10)
- Project proposes to offer advanced, diversified curricular improvements that greatly expand offerings (15)

VI. Innovations in education;

NOTES:

This category judges the criterion based on how the project's proposed educational innovations relate to the facility's design. The staff works closely with county administrators and architects to understand if and how innovative curriculum ideas translate to adjustments in the project and its budget. When innovative educational offerings are proposed, the WVDE is consulted by the County and the SBA to ensure they also have an understanding of the proposal; however, most projects do not tackle this issue. The staff believes consultation from the WVDE is necessary to judge the success of the proposed innovations. If the proposed innovative solution is not effective or likely to be successful, a future project may be required to repair or replace specific components. By assigning a maximum value of five points, the variance in points from projects that do meet this category align with the variance of similar categories.

Scoring System (As shown in Exhibit B)

Points Possible: 5

County	Remarks	Points Awarded
A	The county proposes significant educational innovations in the school with the introduction of the Project-Based Learning curriculum delivery method and Exploratorium arrangement. The SBA staff asks the County to work with the WVDE to provide examples of where this method has been successful or represents a worth investment of SBA funds.	5
B	No innovative educational offering proposed	1
C	No innovative educational offering proposed	1
D	No innovative educational offering proposed, other than the larger classroom spaces.	1

Guidance Provided for Score:

- No innovative educational offering proposed (1)
- Some innovative curriculum and/or breakout STEM spaces provided (3)
- Fully immersed innovative curriculum, “school of the future” (5)

VII. Adequate space for projected student enrollments;

NOTES:

A study of adequate space for student enrollments relates directly to the building’s program utilization. The program utilization is defined as the current student enrollment (or projected enrollment) of the school divided by the building’s program capacity, which is the total number of seats available in each classroom at any point in the day (or an average in middle and high schools). On many occasions, existing schools do not meet the target 80-85% utilization factor, and unless the project affects the number of classroom program spaces available, the variance in score from the baseline total of five is rare. A thorough study of the program utilization is performed by the SBA staff, and on many occasions, this is done in consultation with the school’s principal or a county director. Projected enrollments have recently been provided by the WVDE staff, which has a direct effect on future program utilization.

Scoring System (As shown in Exhibit B)

Points Possible: 10

County	Remarks	Points Awarded
A	The existing elementary and middle schools that the county proposes to eliminate have a 55% and 65% utilization factor respectively, which is very low. The new school, however, proposes to build space that is in excess of the SBA’s square footage allowance; however, as mentioned in the curriculum improvement category, the design of the proposed building is based on the curriculum delivery method, and the SBA staff directs the county to seek approval from the WVBE for this curriculum delivery method, which will qualify the county for an increased square footage allowance to cover the cost of construction.	5
B	While the utilization factor is low compared to the 80-85% target, the project proposes no change to the program utilization.	5
C	While the utilization factor is low compared to the 80-85% target, the project proposes no change to the program utilization.	5
D	The program utilization is calculated without the portable classrooms and shows a 95% utilization factor. An eight-classroom addition brings the program utilization down to 75%. The SBA staff calculates that a five-classroom addition would bring the school to exactly an 85% utilization factor. However, after reviewing the new WVDE projected student enrollments, with the three extra classrooms, the school will be at the targeted program capacity in the next 6 years.	6

Guidance Provided for Score:

- Low severity of need for new spaces proposed (1)
- Project as proposed will meet 80% - 85% utilization factor (5)
- Project will address a school with a high utilization factor > 85% (10)

VIII. The history of efforts taken by the county board to propose or adopt local school bond issues or special levies to the extent Constitutionally permissible;

NOTES:

The SBA staff works with the county to provide a comprehensive list of instances where the local board of education has asked their voters to pass special bond issues or levies for capital improvement projects. While this criterion does not judge the success rate of these bond elections or levy calls, it does ask about the history of efforts to provide local monies to address facility issues. The interpretation of this criterion must be carefully judged in order to meet the Recht Decision's "equal opportunities in education" directive. We must not "penalize" counties whose demographic/economic outlook prevents them from spending resources on futile attempts at running bonds or levy elections. Therefore, the maximum value for this criterion is five, which lessens the impact on counties with low economic opportunities while giving credit to the counties that actively attempt to address issues themselves.

Scoring System (As shown in Exhibit B)

Points Possible: 5

County	Remarks	Points Awarded
A	The county recently ran a special levy to provide additional capital improvement funds to much-needed projects. This was the first levy or bond that had been attempted in the last 5 years after unsuccessful attempts in the past.	5
B	The county has a special levy in place and has each of the last 4 years. The county passed a county-wide facility improvement bond in 2012.	3
C	The county has not had any success in passing bonds or levies in the last 30 years, and the board has decided that spending money to run special bond of levy calls is an "exercise in futility."	1
D	The county has a special levy in place and recently passed a \$60 million capital improvement bond for improvements to all facilities in the county.	5

Guidance Provided for Score:

- County has not proposed a bond issue or special levy in the past five years (1)
- County has proposed a levy in the last four years *and/or* a bond in the last ten years *or* since their bond repayment term ended (5)
- County proposes bond issues and/or special levies regularly (10)

IX. Regularly scheduled preventive maintenance;

NOTES:

Given the SBA's investment in the statewide preventative maintenance (PM) program with the WVDE, the impact of projects that address needs related to turning reactive maintenance into preventative maintenance is extremely beneficial to the SBA's mission. Each county should have a PM plan in place. Working with the WVDE staff and contractors allow the SBA to see which counties are adequately and inadequately using the SBA-funded PM program. The merits of this category directly relate to improving the functionality and longevity of systems and equipment in school facilities; therefore, the maximum value of ten points correlate with the desires of the WVBE and the SBA to reinvest in existing community schools. It should also be known that not all projects have a positive impact on regularly scheduled PM. In some instances, schools have basic, inadequate equipment that requires little PM. In order to meet the building code's air exchange standards, sometimes the solutions bring complex systems that require increased maintenance work. While this is not always the case, the county costs associated with additional maintenance workload that is inherent to the new systems sometimes lessen the points that are awarded.

Scoring System (As shown in Exhibit B)**Points Possible: 10**

County	Remarks	Points Awarded
A	The new facility will have a tremendous impact on the county's PM plan. Because of the age of the existing facilities and components, there is more reactionary maintenance performed than desired. In the new facility, the county maintenance staff will no longer have to work on two separate schools, antiquated units will be removed from service, and the staff will be able to focus efforts on PM rather than being reactionary to problems as they arise.	9
B	Similar to building a new school, the renovated facility is proposed to receive complete infrastructure upgrades that turn reactive maintenance into preventative maintenance.	9
C	The county has a PM plan in place, however, spends significant time and resources being reactionary to the roofing and HVAC issues at this school. The new roof at this school will offer a significant reduction in maintenance requests and will allow the county to spend more time completing PM tasks at this facility and others.	8
D	The proposed project will lessen the impacts of reactionary maintenance needed to support the portable classrooms; however, after consultation with the WVDE, the county is found to be inadequately using the PM services offered by the state. The WVDE staff will actively help train and implement a PM plan for this facility and all others within the county. The SBA must be certain that an investment in this school will be take care of now and in the future.	4

Guidance Provided for Score:

- Project increases maintenance required while county has no PM plan in place (1)
- Project increases maintenance required but county has a PM plan in place (5)
- Project decreases PM required, which has a positive impact on active PM plan (10)

Before proceeding to the final criterion, a review of the first nine categories is done to show the overall application of the criteria and the impact of the next step. The scores for the first nine categories address "How the current facilities do not meet and how the plan and any project under the plan meets the (objective criteria)."

County	Score Earned	Rank
A	65	1
B	37	3
C	35	4
D	42	2

NOTE: Subtotaling the projects before the final criterion is applied is **not** standard practice, as this is only done to show the impact of the final category.

X. How the project will assure the prudent and resourceful expenditure of state funds and achieve the purposes of this article for constructing, expanding, renovating or otherwise improving and maintaining school facilities for a thorough and efficient education.

NOTES:

The scoring system uses a strict interpretation of the code to make recommendations based on the “prudent and resourceful” investment of SBA funds. This criterion has the greatest total of points available, which correlates with the overall importance of the consideration of the project’s impact of state-funded investment. In this twenty-point scale, each project starts with a baseline of ten points and, given the project’s plan to assure that a thorough and efficient education can be more adequately achieved with an investment from the state, points are assigned accordingly. Characteristics and nuances of each specific project are considered in relation to the impacts of the proposed solutions. If, after consideration of the project’s goals and merits, the staff believes that there are alternative solutions that are better, the investment of state funds is considered uneconomical / imprudent, or the proposal is in conflict with the directives of the WVBE or SBA, points are deducted. If the project addresses issues in a well-conceived and thorough manner that the staff can be certain is the most effective and efficient solution, points are added. The staff believes that while this criterion may be interpreted as a subjective opinion, guidelines for achieving a high number of points must be further expanded and explained because of the substantive impact on the overall score. Among many considerations, the following questions, at a minimum, will be asked of each project:

- What is the substantive impact of the project? Can “dollars per impact” be quantified and measured?
- What is the effect of this project on the everyday student / teacher / administrator experience? Does this project improve the educational atmosphere directly or indirectly?
- Have all options been considered to achieve the county’s desired solution? Is there a smarter, more impactful alternative project that could achieve the same goals?
- What are the life-cycle impacts of this project? Is this a smart investment now and in the future?
- Have all the correct steps been followed? Are there outstanding tasks that lead to uncertainty for the success of the project?
- Is the project’s budget adequate? Is the funding request too conservative? Are they asking for enough funding?
- Are there specific items in the proposed budget that are of concern?
- Will the proposed solution adequately meet the intent of addressing the project’s need?
- If available, does the proposed design adequately meet the functional goals of the project?
- Is the project a smart investment for the SBA / State of West Virginia? Have all other funding sources been exhausted?
- Does the county’s local funding commitment correlate to its wealth demographic?
- Does the project adequately achieve the State’s goals for equal opportunities in education; a thorough and efficient education?

The key in addressing each of these questions is to find concrete evidence rather than general feelings and opinions, as the interpretation of the final category has a substantial impact on the overall score. The term “prudent and resourceful expenditure of state funds” is considered judiciously and thoroughly rather than simply considering how much money a county brings to the table.

Scoring System (As shown in Exhibit B)

Points Possible: 20

County	Remarks	Points Awarded
A	This is an excellent project proposal. Only slight concerns with the budget and spaces related to the enhanced curriculum offerings. The local share is significant considering the county’s economic demographic. The county has selected the site that is most feasible both	19

	cost-wise and operationally. The overall impact on the county is excellent as this will adequately serve PreK-8 students in this portion of the county well into the future. This is an excellent investment of funding for the state / SBA.	
B	Based on all available information, this project is generally impactful for all the facility's users. The proposed solution will allow the school to function in its current facility for 20+ more years. The costs are high for this project because the facility is so large, so consideration should be given to break this out into phases if necessary. The county has offered a match that is slightly less than other counties who are considered close to that wealth demographic	14
C	This project proposal is necessary to protect a prior investment of state funds as this school was constructed with SBA funds 25 years ago. The county is considered a financially distressed county, which severely limits their ability to provide any local funding match. If this project is not awarded, the leaks will only continue to compound the necessary work to repair water infiltration damages. The only area of concern is that the price for including necessary HVAC improvements was substantial which caused the county to delay the request to remediate these issues. When the HVAC is replaced, the work required may cause roofing membrane damages.	18
D	The merits of this project show this proposal is worthwhile given the condition of the portables and the need for projected growth. However, because the county has mentioned their desire to complete this project independent of the SBA if funding is not approved and given the county's desire to build three more classrooms than present need dictates that are larger than policies describe, the worthiness of a state investment comes into question. This county clearly has the ability to fund this project in its entirety and, should the SBA desire to participate, it would be at the sacrifice of other worthwhile projects that do not have the ability to fund projects on their own. Therefore, this represents a significant deduction of points in this category.	6

TOTAL SCORES:

County	Score Earned	Rank
A	84	1
B	51	3
C	53	2
D	48	4

SCORE SUMMARY:

County	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	Total
Possible	15	5	10	5	15	5	10	5	10	20	100
A	13	4	7	3	14	5	5	5	9	19	84
B	7	3	5	1	3	1	5	3	9	14	51
C	9	3	5	1	2	1	5	1	8	18	53
D	12	3	5	2	4	1	6	5	4	6	48

SCORE ANALYSIS:

The process concludes as the projects are scored individually in draft format by the respective SBA Assistant Directors that service the submitting counties. The scores are then vetted as a group and questioned thoroughly by the Director of Architectural Services and the Executive Director. In general, the staff's interpretation of the criteria for each of the projects is consistent, and project scores are "calibrated" to ensure similar projects that have similar characteristics receive comparable categorical scores. Where there are significant differences of opinion or significant changes as a result of the interpretation of the final category, the staff spends an appropriate amount of time building a consensus to ensure the best recommendation prevails. In this example, the change in the interpretation of the final category swung Project D from 2nd to 4th place in the rankings because of the negative feelings toward the merits and success of the project related to a state investment. Sometimes this happens and arguments can be made to support each interpretive opinion; however, the goal of recommending projects that exhibit a prudent, resourceful, economic, and efficient expenditure of state funds remains constant.

Below are some thoughts on the example projects' final scores:

- As mentioned in the final category's remarks, **County A**'s PreK-8 school proposal is a great project that checks all the boxes. We see projects with many similar aspects submitted each year, but this example brought all the staff's best interpretations of the criteria together to show how a great project is scored. We rarely see a score this high, but new schools or renovations that propose to achieve this much success most likely earn this score.
- The infrastructure improvements proposed in **County B**'s Middle School (repurposed high school) is a typical configuration seen around the state. Often, counties must make a decision related to proposing significant renovations in an old school that will last approximately 20 years or spend more money to build a brand-new school (that is slightly smaller) which will last 50+ years. The scoring system and new policy is set up to let the counties make these decisions without being pushed one way or the other.
- County C**'s roof replacement is a relatively new issue that the SBA faces. After making a significant investment years ago to build this facility, it now needs a substantial reinvestment to protect and preserve the original grant award. When the SBA was created and the first projects were funded, the hope was that these issues that the project addressed would never have to be dealt with again. However, over the years, there is a tremendous amount of employee turnover and financial situations have not always been adequate. In most situations, maintenance is the first area where cuts are made, and over time, issues compound. The SBA now finds itself dealing with requests to protect a prior investment. This is certainly a worthy project given the example county is considered "financially distressed," but the SBA's finance team has been working with local finance administrators to fund the depreciation of assets so that these requests become fewer.

- **County D's** proposed addition is a project that is most likely a result of failing to develop a working relationship with the SBA staff so that each party understands the other's specific goals and mission. The project is worthwhile to some degree but is excessive on many different levels. The staff cannot in good faith recommend this as a prudent and resourceful expenditure of state funds with respect to the needs in other counties. The final criteria, while sometimes construed as controversial, gives the staff the ability to make this substantive recommendation.

CONCLUSION:

Each of the projects have some level of merit as they represent real need for their respective counties. The staff always works with county administrators and architects to find evidence to substantiate their scores. The thorough review process that each county undergoes is a broad and encompassing evaluation. The final scores reflect a comprehensive, data-driven evaluation process that addresses the three basic questions the Code describes: *How bad is the current situation? How good is the proposed solution? And, is this a good investment for the state?*

Because there are always more projects requested than funds available, the process becomes competitive and is very complex given the amount of data that is vetted and the level of interpretive detail that is inherent. There are certainly many opinions and interpretations that can swing a project above or below the funding line. The staff's desire is for the Authority to have full confidence in this collaborative, data-driven process, and to be assured that the evaluations and recommendations represent a fair / thorough review of each proposal. Because tens of millions of dollars in public funds are on the line to address needs that positively affect the everyday lives of students, teachers, and administrators, the staff does not take this job lightly.

We are certainly open to make changes where the Authority desires, and we would like for this process to continue the evolution of improvement with every funding cycle. We will continue to work with counties and their architects to gain a statewide understanding of the final application of this process.

School Building Authority of West Virginia
SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION FUND NEEDS PROJECT
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
SBA FORM 201

NOTE: In order to provide the best information to the SBA, this form must be filled out completely and with clarity. Please consult with the SBA staff if you have any questions regarding required information on this form.

PROJECT: _____
COUNTY: _____ **COUNTY PRIORITY:** _____

PROPOSED FUNDING SOURCES FOR THIS PROJECT

SBA Funds Request	\$ _____
Local Funds Commitment	\$ _____
Federal Funds	\$ _____
Other Funds (_____)	\$ _____
Total Project Cost	\$ _____

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

COUNTY FINANCE INFORMATION:

Bonding Capacity	\$ _____	Available Bonding Capacity	\$ _____
Excess Levy Capacity	\$ _____	Remaining Levy Capacity	\$ _____

Financially Distressed County by the WVDE? Yes ____ No ____

If you have an Excess Levy:

What percentage are you currently collecting? _____%

What amount of the excess levy is dedicated to capital improvements annually? \$ _____

What is the expiration date of your levy? _____

PROJECT STATUS:

Site Selected:	Yes ____	No ____	New Site	____	N/A	____
Flood Elevation Certification Received:	Yes ____	No ____				
Geotechnical:	Yes ____	No ____				
Existing Board Owned Property:	Yes ____	No ____	Option to Purchase	____		
Survey Performed:	Yes ____	No ____				

Describe all Site Programming / Preliminary Building Design Completed at this time:

SCHOOL CLOSURE STATUS:

School Closure Required	Yes _____	No _____	
County Hearing Complete	Yes _____	No _____	
County BOE Approved	Yes _____	No _____	
WV BOE Approved	Yes _____	No _____	If No, Date Scheduled: _____

OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL IMPACTS OF THIS PROPOSED PROJECT

Describe the Anticipated Annual Savings: \$ _____

Describe the Projected Cost Avoidance: \$ _____

COMPLIANCE WITH SBA REQUIREMENTS AS DESCRIBED IN WV CODE §18-9D-16

Describe how the current facilities do not meet *and* how the project grant request proposes to address the following criteria:

I. HEALTH AND SAFETY

Is the facility located in the flood plain Yes _____ No _____

If the facility has previously been damaged by a flooding event, please indicate the year in which the event occurred and the dollar amount of damage sustained.

Describe how the project addresses student health and safety including, but not limited to, critical health and safety needs.

II. ECONOMIES OF SCALE

Using the grade configuration described, the proposed facility will _____ will not _____ meet the SBA Economies of Scale Guidelines as set forth in Section 207 of the Policy & Procedures Handbook. The facility houses (will house) _____ students while _____ students are required to meet Economies of Scale Guidelines of this grade configuration.

Describe how the proposed project proposes to achieve economies of scale, including compatibility with similar schools that have achieved the most economical organization, facility use and pupil-teacher ratios.

III. REASONABLE TRAVEL TIME

Describe any proposed changes to student travel time and the practical means of addressing other demographic considerations.

IV. MULTI-COUNTY PROJECT

As a part of this project proposal, describe any considerations given include any multi-county and regional planning aspects to achieve the most effective and efficient instructional delivery system.

V. CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT AND DIVERSIFICATION

Describe any considerations given in this project toward curriculum improvement and diversification, including the use of instructional technology, distance learning and access to advanced courses in science, mathematics, language arts and social studies

VI. EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS

Describe any provisions within this project proposal that strive to achieve innovations in education.

VII. ADEQUATE SPACE

Describe how this proposal affects the ability to provide adequate space for the projected student enrollment.

VIII. LOCAL BOND HISTORY EFFORTS

Describe the history of efforts taken by the county board to propose or adopt local school bond issues or special levies to the extent Constitutionally permissible

IX. PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE

Describe how the proposed project impact's the County's regularly scheduled Preventative Maintenance program.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

#1 DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING FACILITIES

- _____ School currently houses grades _____
- Constructed on a _____ acre site in 20__ which is adequate____inadequate____
- _____ major addition(s) in 20__
- Existing _____ story facility contains _____ sq.ft.
- Is the existing facility located in the flood plain Yes____ No ____
- Current enrollment is _____
- 8th Year Projected Enrollment _____
- Building utilization is _____%
- Utilities: Public Water____ On-Site Well____ Public Sewage____
- Package Plant _____ Other _____
- HVAC: Gas _____ Electric _____ Coal _____ Other _____
- What is the facility's Energy Usage Index (EUI)? _____
- Cost to upgrade to current standard is \$ _____
- Existing facility contains _____ major structural problems
- Health, safety and building accessibility, comments: _____

#2 DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING FACILITIES

- _____ School currently houses grades _____
- Constructed on a _____ acre site in 20__ which is adequate____inadequate____
- _____ major addition(s) in 20__
- Existing _____ story facility contains _____ sq.ft.
- Is the existing facility located in the flood plain Yes____ No ____
- Current enrollment is _____
- 8th Year Projected Enrollment _____
- Building utilization is _____%
- Utilities: Public Water____ On-Site Well____ Public Sewage____
- Package Plant _____ Other _____
- HVAC: Gas _____ Electric _____ Coal _____ Other _____
- What is the facility's Energy Usage Index (EUI)? _____
- Cost to upgrade to current standards is \$ _____
- Existing facility contains _____ major structural problems
- Health, safety and building accessibility, comments: _____

Complete one of the above descriptions for each school affected.

SBA 201

<p align="center">EXHIBIT B EVALUATION TEMPLATE (2018-PRESENT)</p>

School Building Authority of West Virginia
NEEDS PROJECT EVALUATION FORM
Questions and Information Criteria Scoring Matrix

Note: The SBA Staff is charged with the objective evaluation of each project based on, *but not limited to*, the following criteria as described in [W.Va. Code §18-9-D-16\(a\)\(3\)\(D\)](#).

County: _____ Project: _____ Date: ____/____/____

Criteria	Remarks	Points Possible	Points Awarded
I. Student Health & Safety (H&S) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited effect on H&S (1) Generally positive effect on H&S (5) Addresses critical H&S Needs (10) Addresses near-emergency H&S needs that cannot be funded locally (15) 		15	
II. Economies of Scale (EOS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does Not meet EOS Guidelines (1) Exactly meets EOS Guidelines <i>or</i> requests an EOS waiver <i>or</i> renovation project (3) Addresses EOS deficiencies by building / renovating to meet EOS reqs. (4) Greatly exceeds EOS Guidelines or (5) 		5	
III. Reasonable Travel Time <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greatly increases student travel time at or near the established limits (1) Lengthens travel time for a majority of students, shortens for a few (3) No change on travel time (5) Shortens travel time for a majority of students, lengthens for a few (7) Shortens travel time for every student (10) 		10	
IV. Multi-County and Regional Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-County Project (1) Single-County Project that could accept students from other counties (3) Multi-County / Regional Project (5) 		5	

V. Curriculum Improvement and Diversification, including Technology and Distance Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No direct or indirect change to curriculum delivery (1) • Limited or indirect changes/improvements to curriculum delivery (5) • Project gives the ability to introduce a new courses or technology; direct curriculum improvement (10) • Project proposes to offer advanced, diversified curricular improvements that greatly expand offerings (15) 		15	
VI. Innovations in Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No innovative educational offering proposed (1) • Some innovative curriculum and/or breakout STEM spaces provided (3) • Fully immersed innovative curriculum, “school of the future” (5) 		5	
VII. Adequate Space for Projected Student Enrollments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low severity of need for new spaces proposed (1) • Project as proposed will meet 80% - 85% utilization factor (5) • Project will address a school with a high utilization factor > 85% (10) 		10	
VIII. History of Efforts taken by the County Board to Propose or Adopt Bond Issues or Special Levies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County has not proposed a bond issue or special levy in the past five years (1) • County has proposed a levy in the last four years and/or a bond in the last ten years or since their bond repayment term ended (5) • County proposes bond issues and/or special levies regularly (10) 		5	
IX. Regularly Scheduled Preventative Maintenance (PM) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project increases maintenance required while county has no PM plan in place (1) 		10	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project increases maintenance required but county has a PM plan in place (3) • Project decreases PM required, which has a positive impact on active PM plan (5) 			
<p>X. How the Project will assure the Prudent and Resourceful expenditure of State Funds and achieve the purposes of WV Code §18-9-D for constructing, expanding, renovating or otherwise improving and maintaining school facilities for a Thorough and Efficient Education.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline of 10, Positive effect from state funds (+), Negative state fund investment (-) • Does this project make a substantive, substantial impact? • Is this the right project considering alternatives? • Are there unanswered questions, incomplete steps? • Is the budget adequate? • What are the life-cycle impacts? • Is the local contribution adequate considering wealth demographic? • Does this contribute to equal opportunities in education? • Does this represent a prudent and resourceful expenditure of state funds? • Is this a good investment for the SBA? 		20	
Grand Total:		100	